



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
RAMONA COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP**

A regular meeting of the Ramona Community Planning Group (RCPG) was held September 4, 2008, at 7 p.m., at the Ramona Community Center, 434 Aqua Lane, Ramona, California.

In Attendance:	Chad Anderson	Chris Anderson	Torry Brean
	Matt Deskovick	Katherine L. Finley	Kathy S. Finley (Arr. 7:55)
	Dennis Grimes	Kristi Mansolf	Vivian Osborn (Arr. 7:18)
	Helene Radzik	Andrew Simmons	Luauna Stines (Arr. 7:30)
	Dennis Sprong	Angus Tobiason	

Excused Absence: Carolyn Dorroh

Helene Radzik, Chair of the RCPG, acted as Chair of the meeting. Kristi Mansolf, Secretary of the RCPG, acted as Secretary of the meeting.

ITEM 1: The Chair Called the Meeting to Order at 7:08 p.m.

ITEM 2: Pledge of Allegiance

ITEM 3: The Secretary Determined a Quorum was Present

ITEM 4 LIST OF ABSENTEES FOR THIS MEETING. Determination of Excused and Unexcused Absences by the RCPG – Secretary Will Read Record Separately from the Minutes – Carolyn Dorroh had an excused absence.

ITEM 5: Approval of Order of the Agenda (Action)

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA.

The Motion passed with **NO OBJECTIONS**, with Carolyn Dorroh, Kathy S. Finley, Vivian Osborn and Luauna Stines absent.

ITEM 6: Roberts Rules of Order – Rules of Parliamentary Procedure to be Followed during Meeting. The Brown Act – General Information on What it is and How it Applies to the RCPG (Chair)

The Chair said Roberts Rules of Order govern how the RCPG meetings are conducted. The Brown Act defines how the public participates in the meeting.

ITEM 7: ANNOUNCEMENTS & Correspondence Received (Chair)

The Chair announced that per County Counsel, Policy I-1 requires members of Planning and Sponsor Groups to disqualify themselves from participation in decision making where there is a reasonably foreseeable material financial effect, distinguishable from the effect on the public generally, on any real property in which the member has a direct or indirect interest worth \$1,000 or more. From the Political Reform Act requirements, which applies to public officials, regulations under that Act provide guidance that, if the real property is located within 500 feet,

then the effect is presumed to be "material". It would only be in rare cases that this presumption would be rebutted.

The Chair announced that during the next week she would be meeting with Supervisor Jacob and the San Diego Foundation to discuss funding opportunities for Ramona with Carol Fowler. The following week there would be a Stakeholder Group meeting for the Housing Element. The County is revising the Farm Employee Housing Program. They are looking for representatives to attend.

Mr. Anderson volunteered to attend.

Ms. Katherine L. Finley asked if the farm employee issue is tied to the recent document from the Farm Bureau? There was a recent meeting in Ramona on this topic.

The Chair had no more information on the item.

Ms. Anderson said that the Association of Realtors is taking the lead on the Housing Element. She will be attendance and will give a report on the meeting.

Ms. Mansolf announced that the woodlot on Main St. was granted an extension by DPLU until September 9, 2008. A Community Development Block Grant Program meeting will be held in Ramona at the Community Center on September 16, 2008, at 6 p.m. A response was received from DPW to the letters sent out regarding the RMWD bollards too close to the roadways. The Spirit of Joy Lutheran Church received a letter from DPLU on their proposal at the intersection of Highland Valley Rd. and Main St. Public sewer is not available at this intersection and cannot be considered available. Annexation to the District would be required for sewer services to be provided, and there are currently no plans for annexation.

ITEM 8: NON-AGENDA ITEMS Presentations from Public on Land Issues not on Current Agenda (No Presentations on Ongoing Projects – These Must be Agendized – None

ITEM 9: Presentation by Bryan Woods on 1987 Ramona Community Plan (Discussion and Possible Action)

The Chair said that there are a number of Community groups working towards the betterment of Ramona. The Chamber, RCPG, and the Town Center Committee with representatives from a number of agencies, are working together. The Committee for a Better Ramona and the Incorporation Group are the newest. With respect to our 1987 Community Plan, it is in need of refinement. Ramona's is not a strong Community Plan. We must address the loss of buildable area, the elements of circulation that were not foreseeable and other elements that have not withstood the test of time. The County has offered to assist in the Community Plan update process. The RCPG has stated they wished any adjustments to the Community Plan be community driven, and she has defended that position. At County meetings with Chairs from other community groups, the Chair has watched existing strong Community Plans referenced and deferred to in the planning process. A strong defensible Plan is imperative to the future of Ramona.

The Chair said that controversy regarding the Community Plan is not the problem. Not having a comprehensive Community Plan to defend is the problem. She asked that we put an end to the problem. If we fail, we have only ourselves to blame. If we work hard and collectively, and

incorporation becomes a reality, then a strong, community-driven, Community Plan must be the template from which this city should grow and prosper.

The Chair introduced Bryan Woods and invited anyone who wished to speak to turn in a speaker slip to provide background information on the intent and direction at the time of the drafting of the 1987 Plan. She had asked George Boggs to share his experience working on the 1987 Plan.

George Boggs said that Mr. Tobiason, Mr. Woods and himself worked on the 1987 Plan. The 1987 Plan was a good plan at the time it was created. Mr. Boggs wrote the specific SPA language. In the last year, they worked on the Plan once a week. They went through the Community block by block. Because the County didn't follow the Plan, it needs to be refined and fine tuned. They spent time coming up with what was in the Community. When the maps were done, they went to the High School so everyone could see their block. Then the maps were sent to the County.

Mr. Woods said that he has been on the Planning Commission for 15 years. We want a Plan that parallels the 1987 Plan. We have 17 percent of the buildable land in the County at our disposal. We need to determine what we want to put our fingerprint on. We need to look at the circulation element to maximize circulation. In the near future, there will be Design Review Standards rather than Design Review Guidelines. These are on the table and will be stronger and more enforceable. The large ranches, the 9 SPA's, were scrutinized in 1987. They worked to create concentric circles of development spreading out from the Town Center. They looked for places for parks. In the year 2000, the Grasslands began to be bought up. Now if we want land to put a road to address concerns, there is a question as to where to put it. The Planning Commission is looking at new SDG&E requirements and new brush management requirements. Growth has to be planned for. This was done in 1987. The buildout for Ramona in 1987 was to be 67,500. There is still land not built out in Ramona. In 1987, they weren't afraid for Ramona to grow.

A Community Plan template has been designed by the consultant, PB&J, hired by the County as a consultant in the GP Update process. The format is good. Circulation for Ramona includes Poway and Julian. Looking at 1987 and now, creating a Plan for Ramona is different, but similar. He has talked with The Nature Conservancy. The funding on lands acquired are State and Federal funds. Land can't be vacated for a bypass. A bypass may be desirable in an emergency. It may be the only way out of town. There are also Airport issues and environmental issues relating to building a bypass. It would be good to get the South Bypass done – also a North Bypass.

Downtown there will be a River Park. The Town Center Committee is meeting again. When the River Park develops, there may be the opportunity for hotels and restaurants to generate revenue for the Community – to make Ramona vibrant.

The Chair said that if we have a strong Community Plan in place and it's defensible, the County will defer to it.

Mr. Woods said Fallbrook has a good plan. They won't lose the things they value that make their community unique. They have created by right, tailored zoning – outside storage, outside eateries – they will keep Fallbrook rural.

Mr. Sprong asked about the North Bypass.

Mr. Woods said the North Bypass was planned to be used by Montecito Ranch and Cumming Ranch and come out in the Acres. It is still possible, but environmental issues and Airport issues have to be addressed.

The Chair said there is a deadline of February 2009 to be part of the Update process. After that, the process becomes a parallel process.

Mr. Woods said that we have to look at the decisions made then and how they affected us. We can't be anti-growth. In 1987, they followed a plan of slow, managed growth. Mr. Woods said they crafted goals and policies. They worked block by block, but by areas. The rural areas have lower density. We can support conservation subdivisions or reject them. A Major Use Permit is necessary to qualify for a conservation subdivision. There are benefits, but it is very controversial. Conservation subdivisions will allow for connectivity for trails and circulation. If not, we can have 1, 2 or 4 acre lots.

The Chair said that the 1987 Plan is Board approved and it is on the books. We have to decide if we want to include parts of the 2002 Plan revision in our Community Plan. Some elements haven't worked. As long as our Plan is defensible, the County will use it.

Mr. Woods said by revisiting our goals and policies, we can guide the planners at the County. Community Character Statements are important. We can use the template and take into consideration the 1987 Plan and the 2002 Plan revision.

Ms. Osborn said that we are constrained with our sewer and water.

Mr. Woods said Ramona needs 200 more acres of sprayfields.

Ms. Osborn said Montecito Ranch and Cumming Ranch can't be served unless there are huge upgrades to the sewer system.

Mr. Woods said we can't legally ask a developer to pay for the sins of the past. Developers only pay for what affects the project.

Ms. Osborn said the 1987 Plan set up to cause this problem.

Mr. Woods said the RMWD is a reactionary body like the RUSD. We have a deficit because of cumulative impacts. There was the EHL legal challenge that resulted in the TIF.

Ms. Osborn asked, taking the problems in context, how do we plan for more development?

Mr. Woods said the land has entitlements. Our job is to mitigate for impacts. Montecito Ranch and Cumming Ranch are not fully entitled. They haven't come before the Planning Commission. Neither is scheduled yet, but both may be done in 2009. The GP Update Plan will be completed in 2010.

Mr. Grimes asked about sewer shortfalls. Package treatment plants are not allowed?

Mr. Woods said that package treatment plants may happen. Sometimes package treatment plants are taken over by a water district.

Mr. Grimes said that with larger lots, conservation subdivisions are not a foregone conclusion.

Mr. Woods said that Conservation Subdivisions required a Major Use Permit. There are 7 elements to be considered, including Community Character, bulk, scale and harmony. We can use that tool if we want and tweak it.

Mr. Grimes said the Montecito Ranch proponent says they were forced into making the project a conservation subdivision.

Mr. Woods said that there is a bill being considered – development has to be surrounded by infrastructure. The Governor may sign the bill. Roads are part of the consideration for conservation subdivisions. The Community Plan will determine how Ramona will look in 20 years. We don't have to allow for spot commercial or segregated commercial development in the Community. At this point in the process, the maps can't be changed.

Mr. Tobiason said that in 1987, they begged to get the SA 603 through.

Mr. Woods said there is no money to pay for it.

Mr. Tobiason said we would like 4 and 8 acre lots in the east part of the Community.

Mr. Woods said we may not have the water to support that density as that area is groundwater dependent. The County groundwater requirements have gotten better so people are not hurt diminishing groundwater.

Mr. Tobiason said the County should get an insurance policy for their open space, especially where it is in the vicinity of people's homes.

Mr. Brean said he has talked to Devon Muto about our Community Plan deadline. We need to get our Community Background and Community Vision Statements done now.

Mr. Woods recommended taking time and looking at everything.

Speaker: Jeff Gan, Ramona Resident

Mr. Gan asked who we are to work with on circulation, especially getting out of town? Our problems are Scripps to Barona. He asked if toll roads could be considered?

Mr. Woods said that we need to work with the roads we have control of. We can't dictate to tribes and schools.

ITEM 10: SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

10-A: PARKS (Brean) (No Business)

10-A-1: Presentation of PLDO Report from Parks Dept.

Mr. Brean did not have the report with him. It will be given at the October meeting.

10-B: GP Update Plan (formerly 2020 Community Plan)(Anderson) (Action Items)

10-B-1: Report on Steering Committee Meeting from 8/23/2008 (Chair)

Ms. Radzik gave the report. Community Plans can be more restrictive but not less restrictive than the General Plan. If the Planning and Sponsor Groups and DPLU are in conflict regarding

minimum lot size (in zoning) it will not end with DPLU. The Planning and Sponsor Groups' position (Steering Committee) will move forward to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. The end of September is the first deadline for the Community Plans. Regarding water delivery – if water delivery is not guaranteed, then the project cannot be processed. Regarding conservation subdivisions – for them to work, there is a Major Use Permit requirement. Jamul/Dulzura requested incorporation of slope development restrictions in the language. The Chair brought up that conservation subdivisions are not a legal requirement of the GP Update process.

Mr. Brean brought up population numbers. There was some discussion with Mr. Muto as to the theory of what the RCPG thought possible when they came up with our numbers. Computer numbers were generated. Lost land was pulled off for open space. Mr. Muto said that the population figure is not used as a benchmark by the County. The numbers are map driven. To change the numbers, the maps must be changed.

10-B-2: Report on Meetings with SANDAG and DPLU (Discussion and Possible Action)(Chair)

The Chair reported on the SANDAG meeting. Ramona has been downgraded from a Smart Growth Community to a potential Smart Growth Community. The County still has us down as a Smart Growth Community. There is a call for requests in September for grants for eligible Smart Growth Communities.

There was discussion on the GP Update Subcommittee Chair not receiving notification of meetings related to the GP Update. She asked to receive information on upcoming meetings so that she could be better prepared.

MOTION: THE CHAIR FOR THE GP UPDATE SUBCOMMITTEE IS NOTIFIED OF ALL RELATED MEETINGS (GP UPDATE) AT THE COUNTY LEVEL WHEN THE MEETING INFORMATION IS RECEIVED.

Upon motion made by Kathy L. Finley and seconded by Chris Anderson, the Motion **passed 12-1-1-0-1**, with Angus Tobiason voting no, Andrew Simmons abstaining, and Carolyn Dorroh absent.

10-B-3: Consideration and Recommendation on Draft Village Limit Line (Carried Over from Special Meeting 6-19-08 and 7-3-08) – Not Addressed

10-C: WEST (Mansolf) (Action Items)

10-C-1: AD 08-041, Additional Story for Main Residence, Roether Residence, 18961 Starvation Mt. Rd., 3.82 acres

Mr. Roether was not in attendance at the RCPG, but did attend the West Subcommittee. Ms. Mansolf gave the report. Mr. Roether lost his residence in the Witch fire. There were avocado trees on site – a few are left. He wants to rebuild and step his house up the side of a mountain. The garage will be on the first story with a bedroom over the garage. He will integrate the boulders and the site in with his house. Essentially, he will be building three stories. No rock will be blasted.

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE PROJECT.

Upon motion made by Kristi Mansolf and seconded by Chris Anderson, the Motion **passed 14-0-0-0-1**, with Carolyn Dorroh absent.

**10-C-2:AD 08-038, Cordiano Boutique Winery, 15732 Highland Valley Rd.
Manno Trust, Owner. 9.79 acres (w/T&T)**

Ms. Mansolf gave the West Subcommittee report. Mr. Cordiano's driveway accesses unto Highland Valley Rd. Mr. Cordiano has a license to produce wine. He wants to sell the wine he produces and have a tasting room. His plot plan shows what is existing and what is proposed. Twenty three parking spaces are proposed. There are 2 driveways – there is a driveway on both the eastern and western parcel. The driveway to be used for the tasting room will be on the western parcel.

There was a concern with site distance on Highland Valley Rd. – a public road.

It was suggested the knob be cut back. Signs are needed to show the entrance to the tasting room.

There were concerns that items were not shown on the plot plan: the length of the driveway, the width of the doorways, ADA compliance, and the property line. A bed and breakfast is shown. It was suggested that each of the elements, such as the gift shop, needs to be prepared, i.e., preparing a plan of the house, showing the bedrooms, places to sit, bathrooms, and establish a firm layout to present. There were concerns with the times shown that the facility will be open – 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. The Zoning Ordinance says 10 a.m. to sunset. There were concerns the neighbors to the project be notified. The County has the requirements for an administrative permit on the DPLU web site. The permit has to make bulk, scale and harmony findings in consideration of the surrounding area. There were concerns with the status of the EIR for Boutique Wineries and what will happen to the project if the EIR doesn't work out.

Ms. Mansolf read some information from DPLU on this topic: There was a challenge and the Board of Supervisors did repeal an earlier Ordinance. A newer version that requires an Administrative Permit for all Boutique Wineries did get approved by the Board on June 18th. The 30 day challenge period has passed. The updated pages are being completed and ready for distribution. A copy of Section 1735 that describes a Boutique Winery and Section 6910 that lists the required findings for granting an Administrative Permit is attached to the West minutes. The findings are the same as for a Major Use Permit. DPLU is currently working on a new Tiered Winery Ordinance that would allow a Boutique Winery by right and create a new classification that would require an Administrative Permit. These new tiers would be in addition to the existing Wholesale Limited Winery (no tasting room or sales) that is allowed by right and a larger Winery that requires a Major Use Permit. If this Tiered Winery Ordinance does not get approved, the existing regulations requiring an Administrative Permit for Boutique Wineries would stay in place.

Mr. Simmons gave the T&T Subcommittee report. The right turn into the driveway has about 100 to 120 feet of visibility; proponent plans to shave the hillside a bit to give it about 300 feet of visibility. No grading permit is needed. A motion was made to approve for the applicant to move forward on the application with the request that the applicant shave part of the hillside next to the road, approximately 5 feet in for a length of 40 feet, to ensure the road meets an approximate 300 feet of visibility.

Mr. Cordiano said he put on the plot plan all of what he may want to do. He wants to have a home-stay not a bed and breakfast. Mr. Cordiano said his access road is 16 feet paved, 24 feet wide.

Ms. Dorroh had submitted a minority opinion on this project.

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE APPLICANT TO MOVE FORWARD ON THE APPLICATION WITH THE REQUEST THAT THE APPLICANT SHAVE PART OF THE HILLSIDE NEXT TO THE ROAD, APPROXIMATELY 5 FEET IN, FOR A LENGTH OF 40 FEET, TO ENSURE THE ROAD MEETS AN APPROXIMATE 300 FEET OF VISIBILITY.

Upon motion made by Andrew Simmons and seconded by Luauna Stines, the Motion passed 13-1-0-0-2, with Matt Deskovick voting no, and Carolyn Dorroh absent.

10-C-3:APN 277-111-32-00, Request for D8 Waiver, Southwest Corner of Highlander Dr. and Highland Creek Rd. Applicant: Harlan

Ms. Mansolf gave the subcommittee report. Mr. Harlan had presented the project. They are in the process of buying the last site with a D8 Designator in the Highlander area. They presented plans signed by the County and photographs. The Zoning Project Manager has been on vacation, and they did not have the D8 Waiver Request form from the County, nor had the RCPG received it. Ms. Mansolf had a copy of the D8 criteria, and it was looked over fairly generally at the subcommittee meeting. There are no boulders on site, and the floodway/ floodplain will not be disturbed. The Harlans are not aware of how much grading will need to be done, but will try and find out the grading summary before the RCPG meeting. The land appears to be fairly flat, except for a small knoll, where the house will go.

Mr. Harlan presented the grading summary, as per the West Subcommittee request.

MOTION: TO RECOMMEND WAIVING THE D8 DESIGNATOR.

Upon motion made by Kristi Mansolf and seconded by Chris Anderson, the Motion passed 14-0-0-0-1, with Carolyn Dorroh absent.

10-C-4:GPA 08-006/PAA08-006, TM 5554/P08-032, P71-396-01, Ramona Air Center. 2493 Montecito Rd., (nearest cross street Montecito Way). A public/private aviation project between the County at the Ramona Airport and the Ramona Air Center, LLC. Includes 42 Separate Buildings, Condominium Plan, Site Plan, Major Use Permit (MUP) and MUP modification, General Plan Amendment, and Road Vacation of SC 931, Montecito Rd. Extension through Airport. (w/T&T)

Ms. Radzik said she received a letter from the Manager of County Airports, Peter Drinkwater, saying that the Ramona Airport will be secured with a gate and fencing, and the road vacation of Montecito Rd. would be consistent with the RCPG action of June, 2006, the Board of Supervisors' action of August, 2006, and the FAA's and TSA's request to implement security measures at the Airport. The RCPG does not need to take action on the vacation since it is now not in our purview and a moot point.

Ms. Anderson said that the Design Review Board likes the project. There was a request to modify certain plants. They wanted the roof colors to not stand out. The project needs to be reviewed for lighting and signage.

Mr. Higgins said that last year, they came to the RCPG with an interim update on the project of hangers at the airport. On the private side, people will own the hangers and the land. Fifty-six hangers will be constructed. The other side of the project – the public side will have hangers developed that will be available for lease from the County. There is a 50 acre foot print for the project. The Notice of Preparation of EIR will be out in the fall. There will be low ADT's. The buildings will depict the treatments of historic buildings in the area. The aviation office will be on the far west side of the project. There will be a restaurant. They asked the landscape architect to look at the history of landscaping in the area. The storm drains all need to have filters and traps. Drainage will go through the grass and sand to bioswales. They have to adhere to stormwater standards. They will develop micro parks within the project. There will be Community benefits. The project will help the tax base. The County wants to take over the road vacation part of the project. Mr. Higgins would like a vote for them to be able to continue with the project.

In response to questions asked by the RCPG, Mr. Higgins said CCR's and bylaws will be part of the project for the private portion. There will be a full bath in the private part of the project, but the condos can't be lived in. The HOA will maintain the drainage areas in the private part. The HOA will have a budget and dues. A guard will be patrolling the area at night. There will be a security gate on Montecito Rd. at the Airport. When someone comes up to the gate, they will be asked who they are and allowed to go through.

Ms. Osborn said the sewer use for the project was not resolved as per the 2002 Airport EIR.

Mr. Tobiason had questions on the road vacation issue. If we agree to vacate the County road, he wanted to see a representative road as part of the project.

Mr. Higgins said that Montecito Rd. doesn't go all the way through to Rangeland now. It stops within the Airport. Montecito Rd. will be an internal circulation road for the project. He thinks Mr. Tobiason is thinking of the Northern Bypass.

Mr. Simmons said Montecito Rd. wouldn't function anyway during an emergency if it goes through due to the presence of emergency vehicles. Montecito Way may work as an alternative route.

Ms. Dorroh had submitted a minority opinion on the project.

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED. WE RECOMMEND THE PROJECT CONTINUE FORWARD.

Upon motion made by Andrew Simmons and seconded by Chad Anderson, the Motion **passed 14-0-0-0-1**, with Carolyn Dorroh absent.

10-D: EAST (Mansolf) (No Business)

10-E: SOUTH (Stines) (Action Items)

10-E-1:P08-008 Replacement Map, 23401 Calistoga Pl/Calistoga Dr.

PlanCom Telecommunication Facility Proposed To Be Placed on RMWD Water Tank. Owner is SDCE

Ms. Mansolf was in contact with the County planner for this project. Even though the RCPG had approved this cell site previously, the County wanted us to review the project again because a new design was used. The cell site antennas will be mounted directly to the RMWD water tank. The RMWD would never allow this in the past due to potential liability issues for their employees.

Mr. Marioncelli said he met with the RMWD General Manager and some other RMWD staff and it was determined that the antenna could be mounted directly on the water tank.

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE REPLACEMENT MAP.

Upon motion made by Luauna Stines and seconded by Chad Anderson, the Motion **passed 14-0-0-0-1**, with Carolyn Dorroh absent.

10-E-2: MUP 84-045-04 Replacement Map, Ramona United Methodist Church, 3333 Chapel Lane, by Hwy 67 and Dye Rd. Expansion of Proposed Education Building

Ms. Stines apologized for not having a meeting but she was unable to do so.

Ms. Anderson said the Design Review Board approved the project. The Education Building was 1,600 square feet and has been increased to 1,678 square feet since the last time the RCPG saw it.

The applicant said there is a minor deviation to elevation. The site is on septic. DEH approved it.

MOTION: TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE REPLACEMENT MAP.

Upon motion made by Luauna Stines and seconded by Chris Anderson, the Motion **passed 14-0-0-0-1**, with Carolyn Dorroh absent.

10-F: AHOPE (Osborn) (No Business)

10-G: CUDA (Simmons) (Action Items)

**10-G-1: Sunrise Villas Apartments, S06-009, Request by Applicant to Waive the Under grounding of Utilities (Policy I-92) Bruce Steingraber, Consultant (w/T&T)
(Applicant requested to be on September agenda)**

The applicant did not attend the RCPG meeting. Ms. Mansolf said the applicant originally requested to be on the agenda for the undergrounding of utilities. The project had already been approved by the County so it was hard to get information on it. In the process, it was discovered that the applicant would not be putting in meandering sidewalks as we and the Design Review Board had been told. DPW said there wasn't enough room and meandering sidewalks in this area would be a maintenance problem. This item further addressed under Item 10-I and Item 12-B.

The Chair requested that an official request be made of the County on this issue.

10-G-2: S03-079-01, Olive Street Self Storage, Addition of 2nd Story (988 sq. ft.) to

Previously Approved Building "A" – to be a Manager's Unit. Modification to Existing Approved Site Plan. 1031 Olive St. Owner: Auerbach Family Trust

Ms. Mansolf remembers this project coming to the RCPG in the past, and it was approved – the addition of a 2nd story manager's unit.

Speaker: Jeff Gan, Ramona Resident

Mr. Gan was in attendance, representing the applicant. The project was sold to his client without the manager's unit ever having been all the way through the County process.

Ms. Anderson said the Design Review Board liked this project and approved it with changes to additional square footage and landscape.

MOTION: TO APPROVE.

Upon motion made by Kristi Mansolf and seconded by Chris Anderson, the Motion **passed 13-0-0-1-1**, with Angus Tobiason stepping down, and Carolyn Dorroh absent.

10-H: TRANSPORTATION/TRAILS (Simmons) (Action Items)

**10-H-1: Sunrise Villas Apartments, S06-009, Request by Applicant to Waive the Undergrounding of Utilities (Policy I-92) Bruce Steingraber, Consultant (w/CUDA)
(Applicant requested to be on September agenda)**

10-H-2: AD 08-038, Cordiano Boutique Winery, 15732 Highland Valley Rd. Manno Trust, Owner. 9.79 acres (w/West)

10-H-3: GPA 08-006/PAA08-006, TM 5554/P08-032, P71-396-01, Ramona Air Center. 2493 Montecito Rd., (nearest cross street Montecito Way). A public/private aviation project between the County at the Ramona Airport and the Ramona Air Center, LLC. Includes 42 Separate Buildings, Condominium Plan, Site Plan, Major Use Permit (MUP) and MUP modification, General Plan Amendment, and Road Vacation of SC 931, Montecito Rd. Extension through Airport. (w/West)

10-H-4: Department of Parks and Recreation, Community Trails Master Plan/County Trails Program – Update of Ramona Community Trails and Pathways Plan to be Considered

Ms. Mansolf asked about the trail proposed in the vicinity of Dos Picos Park and going to Poway. She wanted to see a map of this trail alignment. It sounds like a trail that was proposed a few years ago but removed.

No one had a map of the trails and there was no one available to answer specific questions on this issue.

MOTION: TO ACCEPT, APPROVE AND SEND TO THE COUNTY THE NEW TRAIL ADDITIONS FOR INCLUSION INTO THE COMMUNITY TRAILS MASTER PLAN/COUNTY TRAILS PROGRAM.

Upon motion made by Andrew Simmons and seconded by Kathy S. Finley, the Motion **passed 13-2-0-0-1**, with Vivian Osborn and Angus Tobiason voting no, and Carolyn Dorroh absent.

10-H-5:Traffic Advisory Committee, Radar Recertification for Arena Way

Mr. Simmons said that when radar recertification occurs, the result is often a faster speed limit rather than a slower one. The results follow 85 percent of fastest recorded speeds.

MOTION: TO DENY THIS RADAR RECERTIFICATION REQUEST BECAUSE IT WILL MAKE THE SPEEDS FASTER NOT SLOWER.

Upon motion made by Andrew Simmons and seconded by Vivian Osborn, the Motion **passed 14-0-0-0-1**, with Carolyn Dorroh absent.

10-H-6:Traffic Advisory Committee, Radar Recertification for 11th Street

MOTION: TO DENY THIS RADAR RECERTIFICATION REQUEST BECAUSE IT WILL MAKE THE SPEEDS FASTER NOT SLOWER.

Upon motion made by Andrew Simmons and seconded by Kristi Mansolf, the Motion **passed 14-0-0-0-1**, with Carolyn Dorroh absent.

10-I: DESIGN REVIEW (Anderson) – Update on Projects Reviewed by the Design Review Board

Ms. Anderson gave the Design Review Board report. Pepe's Produce received a site plan waiver, but Code Enforcement states that they need to do a full site plan since they added signs. Design Review is trying to arrange a meeting with Code Enforcement on this. They are checking on the status of Stars. The woodlot next to Cheers has no change yet. The tree was cut down on the Longs Drugs lot. Regarding the taco shop at Main and Pala – signs are in abundance. The awnings on the fitness were on the site plan but never added to the building. A citation was issued on July 30, 2008. The owner is willing to comply.

Ms. Anderson said if an element is on the site plan, the Design Review Board will push it. This can be done with the meandering sidewalks for the Sunrise Villas apartments.

Ramona Village Design is updating working on a Phase I document. They are working to identify some lots/parcels that may be used for off street public parking in Old Town. There is a meeting scheduled on September 9 with Dianne Jacob and the San Diego Foundation to discuss funding.

The Design Review Board reviewed the Bank of America minor deviation to site plan and approved it. They saw signage and landscaping for San Diego Family Housing and approved it. For Richardson Recycling – they are shut down and are looking at purchasing the lot next door so they can reopen. For KFC, they looked at signage changes, and they approved it with the request the pole and bucket signs are removed. They looked at as-built detached structures on Little Page Rd. for a winery where the fire took out the main house. This was approved. The Design Review Board approved additions to the Chamber of Commerce site.

10-J: TOWN CENTER COMMITTEE (Brean/Simmons) Update on Town

Center Committee Meetings – Report to RCPG

Mr. Brean gave the report. Mr. Brean discussed the Committee meeting with CalTrans and the County to answer questions and to look at the feasibility of introducing a median on parts of Main, such as in front of the Town Hall. Mr. Brean said xeriscape is being considered for a landscaping because it doesn't require maintenance – also cactus rock. There has been discussion of contrast of the center median – creating texture on the side. This will take out parking. Parking is necessary. It is impossible now to flair out the sidewalks. Funding may be available for parking. The impediments of someone wanting to improve a business or to put a business in Ramona are the TIF and sewer charges. There was discussion of accents on side streets. For example, Poway has light poles. Events can be advertised on light poles since we can't have the banner up over Main St. anymore. There was discussion of trash and lights. They are thinking long term with the trees. Should the eucalyptus be replanted? They can be dangerous. This item has been referred to the Tree Trust. If there is feedback on anything, please give it to Andrew or Torry.

ITEM 11: Other Business

ITEM 12: ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (Chair)

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES 8-7-08 (Action)

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF 8-7-08.

Upon motion made by Luauna Stines and seconded by Dennis Grimes, the Motion **passed 11-0-3-0-1**, with Chris Anderson, Torry Brean and Katherine L. Finley abstaining, and Carolyn Dorroh absent.

B. Concerns From Members

Mr. Sprong said that he is concerned with tabling the discussion if there is no proponent present.

Ms. Anderson said the Design Review Board will deny a project if it is on the agenda twice and the proponent doesn't show up.

C. Names Submitted for New Subcommittee Members (Action)

MOTION: TO ADD LUAUNA STINES AND BEVERLY MAES TO THE WEST SUBCOMMITTEE.

The Motion **passed** with **NO OBJECTIONS**, with Carolyn Dorroh absent.

D. Agenda Requests

MOTION: TO ADD THE CONSENT AGENDA AND CONSIDER WHAT OTHER GROUPS SUCH AS THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD DOES WITH 'NO SHOWS'.

Upon motion made by Dennis Sprong and seconded by Chris Anderson, the Motion **passed 14-0-0-0-1**, with Carolyn Dorroh absent.

E. The County wants to Present to the RCPG Low Impact Development Training At October Regular Meeting. State Water Quality

**Regulations and County Ordinance Require Development Projects
Use these Techniques (Discussion and Possible Action)**

- F. Consideration of Direction of GP Update (Discussion and Possible
Action) – Not Addressed**

ITEM 13: Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,

Kristi Mansolf